



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,614	12/05/2003	Marc Dymetman	115798	7899
27074	7590	08/23/2007	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC. P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320				RIDER, JUSTIN W
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2626		
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
08/23/2007			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction27074@oliff.com
jarmstrong@oliff.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/727,614	DYMETMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Justin W. Rider	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed 05 December 2003.

Claims 1-22 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed 30 April 2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. An English version/abstract of the listed references ‘**Normalisation de Documents par Analyse du Contenu a l'Aide d'un Modèle Sémantique et d'un Générateur**’ and ‘**Webpage of "Le Pipotron": <http://www.rigoler.com/jeux/pipotron/pipotron>**’ have not been provided. Accordingly, this reference has not been considered and a line has been drawn through the reference on the PTO-1449. All other references listed on the IDS have been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 and 11-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Borovoy et al. (US Patent No. 5,873,107)** referred to as **Borovoy** hereinafter in view of **Max et**

al., ‘**Reversing Controlled Document Authoring to Normalize Documents**’ referred to as **Max** hereinafter.

Claims 1 and 11: **Borovoy** discloses a method and system for processing input data, comprising:

i. receiving short note input data (col. 3, lines 15-18, ‘*the author enters text in one portion of the user interface. Keywords are extracted from the text as the author enters the text and are used as query words,*’).

However, while **Borovoy** does use existing authored documents to re-create or ‘author’ text, **Borovoy** fails to, but **Max** does specifically disclose the use of semantic grammars (p. 1, Introduction, ‘*to allow the user to specify an underlying semantic representation of the document that is well-formed and complete,*’) to generate semantic structures (p. 1, Introduction, ‘*This representation is then used to produce a fully controlled version of the document,*’).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the teachings of **Max** in the invention of **Borovoy** because **Max** discloses the use of a semantic structure of raw documents to efficiently produce completely controlled versions of text.

The method of **Borovoy** further comprises:

iii. producing with a first realization grammar a plurality of local text realizations from the semantic structures (col. 3, lines 19-22, ‘*Those queries return relevant material from the document collection in a second portion of the user interface.*’);

iv. matching the short note input data with ones of the plurality of local text realizations to define a final semantic structure (col. 3, lines 19-22, ‘*Those queries return relevant material*

from the document collection in a second portion of the user interface. ' [emphasis supplied]); and

v. producing with a second realization grammar a global text realization from the final semantic structure (col. 4, lines 15-17, '*in the preferred embodiment of the present invention he can select a returned portion to see the rest of the document return.* ').

Claims 2-3 and 12-13: **Borovoy** discloses the method and system as per claims 1 and 11 above, further comprising outputting the global text realization to an output device (col. 4, lines 15-17, '*in the preferred embodiment of the present invention he can select a returned portion to see the rest of the document return.* ' [emphasis supplied, as per on a computer monitor]).

Claims 4 and 14: **Borovoy**, in view of **Max** discloses a method as per claims 1 and 11 above, wherein **Borovoy** fails to but **Max** does further disclose wherein the short notes input data are semantic abbreviations (p. 3, e.g. AllergyWarning, TypeOfSymptom, etc...).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the teachings of **Max** in the invention of **Borovoy** because of the reasons outlined above.

Claims 5, 15 and 21: **Borovoy**, in view of **Max** discloses a method as per claims 1 and 11 above, wherein **Borovoy** fails to but **Max** does further disclose wherein the short note input data comprises a plurality of short notes, and wherein matching the short note input data with ones of the plurality of local text realizations to define a final semantic structure comprises:

i. performing a fuzzy match between the plurality of local text realizations and the short notes to provide a local text realization associated with each short note (p. 4, '*we made this process fuzzy by matching...* '); and

ii. defining the final semantic structure based on the local text realizations (p. 1,

Introduction, 'we could obtain the semantic structure corresponding to a raw document...[and then] incomplete representations after automatic analysis could be interactively completed).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the teachings of **Max** in the invention of **Borovoy** because of the reasons outlined above.

Claim 6: **Borovoy**, in view of **Max** discloses a method as per claim 1 above, wherein **Borovoy** discloses selecting one from a plurality of potential text entries (FIG. 2), however failing to but **Max** does further disclose 1, wherein the short note input data comprises a plurality of short notes, and wherein matching the short note input data with ones of the plurality of local text realizations to define a final semantic structure comprises:

i. performing a fuzzy match between the plurality of local text realizations and the short notes to provide at least one local text realization associated with each short note (p. 4, '*we made this process fuzzy by matching...* ');

ii. defining the final semantic structure based on the selected local text realizations (p. 1,
Introduction, 'we could obtain the semantic structure corresponding to a raw document...[and then] incomplete representations after automatic analysis could be interactively completed).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the teachings of **Max** in the invention of **Borovoy** because of the reasons outlined above.

Claims 7 and 16: **Borovoy**, in view of **Max** discloses a method and system as per claims 6 and 15 above, wherein performing a fuzzy match comprises assigning a rank to each local text

realization associated with each short note (p. 4, '*consider the representations with the best similarity scores...* ').

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the teachings of **Max** in the invention of **Borovoy** because of the reasons outlined above.

Claim 8: **Borovoy**, in view of **Max** discloses a method as per claim 1 above, wherein **Borovoy** discloses displaying the short notes and said at least one local text realization associated with each short note and selecting one from a plurality of potential text entries (FIG. 2), however failing to but **Max** does further disclose 1, wherein the short note input data comprises a plurality of short notes, and wherein matching the short note input data with ones of the plurality of local text realizations to define a final semantic structure comprises:

- i. performing a fuzzy match between the plurality of local text realizations and the short notes to provide at least one local text realization associated with each short note (p. 4, '*we made this process fuzzy by matching...*');
- ii. defining the final semantic structure based on the selected local text realizations (p. 1, Introduction, '*we could obtain the semantic structure corresponding to a raw document...[and then] incomplete representations after automatic analysis could be interactively completed* ').

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the teachings of **Max** in the invention of **Borovoy** because of the reasons outlined above.

Claim 9: **Borovoy**, in view of **Max** discloses a method as per claim 8 above, wherein performing a fuzzy match comprises assigning a rank to each local text realization associated with each short not (p. 4, '*consider the representations with the best similarity scores...* ').

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the teachings of **Max** in the invention of **Borovoy** because of the reasons outlined above.

Claims 17 and 18: Claims 17 and 18 are similar in scope and content to that of claim 8 above and so therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 19 and 22: **Borovoy**, in view of **Max** discloses a system and computer program for processing input text, comprising:

- i. means for inputting short notes (col. 3, lines 15-18, '*the author enters text in one portion of the user interface. Keywords are extracted from the text as the author enters the text and are used as query words,* ');
- ii. means for generating and outputting a global text realization based on the short notes (col. 4, lines 15-17, '*in the preferred embodiment of the present invention he can select a returned portion to see the rest of the document return.* ').

Claim 20: **Borovoy**, in view of **Max** discloses a computer program as per claim 19 above.

However, **Borovoy** fails to, but **Max** does specifically disclose the use of semantic grammars (p. 1, Introduction, '*to allow the user to specify an underlying semantic representation of the document that is well-formed and complete,* ') to generate semantic structures (p. 1,

Introduction, '*This representation is then used to produce a fully controlled version of the document,*');

ii. a computer readable program code for producing with a first realization grammar a plurality of local text realizations from the semantic structures (col. 3, lines 19-22, '*Those queries return relevant material from the document collection in a second portion of the user interface.*');

iii. a computer readable program code for matching the short note input data with ones of the plurality of local text realizations to define a final semantic structure (col. 3, lines 19-22, '*Those queries return relevant material from the document collection in a second portion of the user interface.* [emphasis supplied]); and

iv. a computer readable program code for producing with second realization grammar global text realizations from the final semantic structure (col. 4, lines 15-17, '*in the preferred embodiment of the present invention he can select a returned portion to see the rest of the document return.*').

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

While Borovoy and Max teach the input text processing system as above, they, as well as other related prior art fail to specifically teach determining a descriptor for each short note; providing descriptors for each local text realization; determining a fuzzy similarity measure

between the descriptors for short notes and the descriptors for local text realizations; and ranking local text realizations based on the fuzzy similarity measure between the descriptors of the short notes and the descriptors of the local text realizations.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. **Kuga et al. (US Patent No. 5,280,573)** discloses a method for editing input information by using correlated keyword data; **Hayashi et al. (US Patent No. 5,307,266)** and **Satoh et al. (US Patent No. 5,523,945)** disclose the use of structured keywords to process documents; **Nordstrom (US Patent No. 6,269,329)** discloses a text building system using semantic structures; and **Tsourikov et al. (US 2002/0010574 A1)** discloses semantic processing for phrase building.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin W. Rider whose telephone number is (571) 270-1068. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R. Hudspeth can be reached on (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

J.W.R.
15 August 2007


DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600